

RADIO PROPAGANDA REPORT

REPORT ON CUBAN PROPAGANDA -- NO. 3

THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION:

The Cuban Position in the Sino-Soviet Dispute
Fanning of Revolution in Latin America
Defiance of the United States
Subordination of Domestic Issues

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Current Developments Series

CD.219

18 January 1963

CONFIDENTIAL

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

Radio Propaganda Reports are based on the analysis of propaganda covered by FBIS and are issued without any outside coordination. Inferences drawn solely from propaganda content should be tested against other evidence before being accepted.

WARNING

This material contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, USC, Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

Outline of Contents

The Cuban Position in the Sino-Soviet Dispute Page 1

Castro formally announced a Cuban stand in regard to the bloc dispute in his 2 January speech on the fourth anniversary of the revolution--his first appearance on radio or television since just after the climax of the Cuban crisis. Expressing regret over the divisions in the communist world but declining to commit himself to either side, he insisted only on the importance of unity "within and without." On 15 January, at a Congress of Women of the Americas, Castro again deplored the bloc differences and promised not to "throw fuel on the fire."

Castro's neutral appeal for unity represented not so much a statement of impartiality as a declaration of noninvolvement. But well before his speeches, Cuban publicity media had begun engaging in a calculated display of impartiality by giving prominent play to major polemical documents from both sides--a "neutrality" which, by according the dissenting Chinese position equal status with the Soviet, inevitably favors Peking.

Fanning of Revolution in Latin America Page 9

Castro's anniversary speech and subsequent address to the women's congress dramatized his preference for Peking's militant approach to revolution--one evident factor underlying Havana's elevation of the Chinese line in the bloc dispute to equal stature with that of the power which has been Cuba's primary benefactor. In holding up Cuba's revolution as an example for other Latin American countries he repeated a consistent theme of his own earlier speeches and of Cuban propaganda generally. This time, however, he left out the corollary that Cuba does not export its revolution and does not interfere in other countries' affairs--the qualifier he had previously appended to prior discussions of the Cuban "example." At the women's congress he spoke of "hurling the masses into battle" and of "the duty of all revolution to recreate the revolution." He said Cuba did not rule out the possibility of a peaceful changeover ("because we are not dogmatists!"), but added that "we are still awaiting the first case."

CONFIDENTIAL

(continued)

Outline of Contents

Fanning of Revolution in Latin America (continued)

The Chinese and Soviet propaganda treatments of the women's congress speech provide a measure of its orientation in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Peking media gave the speech extensive publicity, including all the portions on militant revolution; Moscow carried an innocuous 300-word summary focusing on the better life of women in Castro's Cuba.

Defiance of the United States Page 14

Some 70 percent of Castro's hour and a half speech on 2 January was devoted to an attack on President Kennedy and U.S. policies, about par for the course. The bulk of his attack was built around the President's reception of the Bay of Pigs prisoners in Miami, and he was if anything more insulting toward the President than in the past. The speech differed from previous ones principally by its frequent, insistent references to Cuban armed might as displayed in the elaborate anniversary parade.

Subordination of Domestic Issues Page 18

Castro covered Cuban domestic programs in only a few brief sentences in the anniversary speech. On prior anniversaries he had discoursed at length on the regime's annual slogan: 1960 was the "Year of Agrarian Reform," 1961 the "Year of Education," 1962 the "Year of Planning." This time, after pronouncing the traditional concluding watchword "Fatherland or death, we will win," he turned to leave the rostrum and then returned to announce briefly, as if in afterthought, that 1963 would be the "Year of Organization." Where last year's CUBA SOCIALISTA article on the revolution at home was written by Castro, this year's was by President Dorticos, further underscoring Castro's current preoccupation with external and intrabloc affairs.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 -

THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

A. THE CUBAN POSITION IN THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE

Fidel Castro's traditional speech on the fourth anniversary of victory of the Cuban revolution, delivered on 2 January, broke a two-month abstinence from public statements and spelled out for the first time a Cuban policy in regard to the Sino-Soviet dispute. The speech was carried by all Cuban radio networks, domestic and international, and on television. It was Castro's first public address since 17 October, five days before the President's announcement of the naval quarantine, and his first statement over radio or television since 2 November, when in an "interview" he set forth his views on U.N. inspection and admitted that there had been "differences" with the Soviet Union during the crisis. In the interval between 2 November and the anniversary celebration--a period that encompassed Mikoyan's protracted four-week visit and the widening of the Sino-Soviet schism in the wake of Khrushchev's backdown in the crisis--Cuban publicity media reported no word from Castro on the question of relations with the Soviet Union or the bloc.

Nonpartisanship in the Dispute: A Pro-Chinese "Neutrality"

In the anniversary speech Castro made no reference to the "differences" with the Soviet Union that he had acknowledged in his 2 November interview. He addressed himself, in a few sentences, to the differences dividing the communist world, referred ambiguously to things that "divide us within and without," and appealed for unity. He remained silent regarding the causes of the disunity, offered no opinions, and suggested no remedies beyond the quest for "unity":

"What are the differences in the bosom of the socialist family, the public differences between large forces of the socialist camp? That concerns us all. It concerns us because we see with clarity here, from this trench 90 miles from the Yankee empire, how much cause for concern those differences can be, how much unity is needed, how much all the strength of the entire socialist camp is needed to face up to those enemies."

"We understand it to be our duty to struggle for unity under the principles of the socialist family, of the socialist camp. That is to be the line of our people, the line followed by the political leadership of the revolution."

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT

18 JANUARY 1963

- 2 -

"A guide for our people: Our task is to unite within and without, to eliminate everything that divides us within and without, to struggle for everything that unites us within and without. The unity of all principles--that is our line."*

On 13 January the newspaper HOY, the press organ most closely associated with the old-line communists in the regime, seconded Castro's line in a frontpage editorial. PRENSA LATINA quoted from the editorial as follows:

"Differences in the socialist camp countries, in the bosom of the world communist movement, between revolutionaries of every area, are used by our enemies, who are encouraged by them to redouble their attacks, step up their aggressions, and multiply their provocations. We Cubans see this very clearly. Our revolution is under constant siege from the imperialists."

"Because of this, we must refrain from fanning public polemics over the differences that have arisen among our parties. Such public polemics do not contribute to unity, but to a deepening of the differences, to the enemy's taking advantage of it to enter through the cracks, promote suspicion, and split those who should and must be united."

HOY thus conveyed endorsement of Castro's neutral stance by the group within the regime that would be most prone to urge close alignment with Moscow and support of the CPSU in the controversy.

On 15 January, addressing the Congress of Women of the Americas, Castro repeated the line with more emphasis and less reserve than he had used in his anniversary speech, and with an allusion (however unelaborated) to the "difficult situation" in which Cuba has been placed by the quarrel between its primary benefactor and the power that lent it moral support during the humiliation it suffered in the Cuban crisis. Castro told the women's congress:

"Let it be admitted that our country faces a difficult situation...because of the divisions, or disagreement, or however one may wish to call them, more or less optimistically,

* Textual citations, indicated by quotation marks, are provided in this report whenever possible. Statements given in the first person but not enclosed in quotation marks are paraphrases, in all such cases the only versions available in translation.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

within the socialist camp. We have stated our position. We are not going to throw fuel on the fire of these disagreements. I believe that anyone who throws fuel on the fire of these disagreements is harming the interests of the world revolutionary movement."

"Marxism-Leninism is sufficiently rich in ideological resources and in experience to find adequate ways to overcome this difficulty, to overcome this obstacle. It is a matter of resolving to do so, and I believe that we must fight for this. We must fight for this unity, and this we propose to do, with our own criterion: Chauvinism? No, rather Marxism-Leninism.... It is deplorable, most deplorable, that those differences should have arisen, and we must fight against them."

Castro's definition of Cuban policy in the bloc dispute--an advocacy of unity that could of itself offend neither side--represents not so much a statement of impartiality as a declaration of noninvolvement. Well before Castro's speeches, however, the Cuban press had begun a display of impartiality by publicizing materials favorable to both sides.

On 30 November, for example, the magazine BOHEMIA carried an article, replete with photographs, on Albania's "rapid industrialization" under Hoxha as compared with its backwardness under the old regime--and balanced it off with a similar article, equally adorned pictorially, on Yugoslavia's progress and "ties of close friendship" with Cuba. The article on Albania contained numerous quotations from a ZERI I POPULLIT article which, as publicized by the Albanian press agency on 2 November and by Peking's NCNA on the 6th, contained the charge of a "Munich" in the Cuban crisis. BOHEMIA's quotations did not include any of the passages critical of the Soviet Union, but it seems more than coincidental that the magazine chose to quote from this particular article at all.

More recently, on 15 January, PRENSA LATINA publicized a Cuban cultural agreement with Albania--having earlier reported, at greater length, the signing of a similar agreement with Hungary and new trade pacts with both Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Both during and after the recent revolution anniversary celebrations, Cuban publicity media gave considerable attention to the activities of both Soviet and Chinese Communist visitors. More space was devoted to the Soviet visitors, an imbalance perhaps traceable simply to the fact that the visitors from the CPR included no such obvious propaganda drawing cards as the USSR's Cosmonaut Pavel Popovich and Soviet Academy of Sciences President Pyotr Fedoseyev. Fidel Castro was not reported to have been in the welcoming delegations for either group of visitors, though Raul Castro

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT

18 JANUARY 1963

- 4 -

welcomed Popovich and the other Russians. The Havana radio and PRENSA LATINA, while quoting more frequently from statements by the prominent Russian visitors, did not neglect the Chinese or the Albanians, carrying reports of their statements and activities almost daily. CPR delegation leader Hu Chi-li was quoted on 28 December as saying: "The fondness that we Chinese feel for Cuba is very great, and anyone who doubts it can only be convinced by visiting my country." An Albanian woman delegate was quoted on 10 January as saying that Castro in his speech outlined "a program that will be of great help in our party's work."

PRENSA LATINA has frequently toed the line of neutrality to the extent of using both Soviet and Chinese reports in the same dispatch. For example, on 3 January, statements by Soviet Ambassador Alekseyev and CPR Ambassador Shen Chien were carried in the same item, each of them praising the anniversary parade and pledging the undying support of his country for the Cuban revolution. PRENSA LATINA on 4 January reported in the same dispatch a message of solidarity from Song Yung, president of the North Korean cultural relations committee, and one from Ortutay Gyula, secretary general of the Hungarian Popular Front.

The practice of impartiality, relatively innocuous insofar as it manifested itself in such displays of friendship and good will toward bloc states on both sides of the ideological fence, becomes less innocuous in its extension to the polemic itself. Thus the Cuban press gave prominent play to Khrushchev's major polemical address to the Supreme Soviet on 12 December--publicity that would have been dictated by propriety, in view of the speaker and the forum, whether the speech had been polemical or not. But the Havana press followed its two-installment text of Khrushchev's speech with prominent publicity (in REVOLUCION) for the text of the Peking PEOPLE'S DAILY's 15 December editorial rebuttal, under an eight-column headline and with subheads highlighting the Chinese position on critical issues in the dispute--publicity that would not be dictated by protocol.

* The major headline read "The Communist Party of the CPR Proposes a Meeting of All the Communist and Workers Parties of the World." Soviet media were studiously ignoring the fact that the Chinese had appealed for a world congress, which would imply the CPR's right to an equal hearing on issues the CPSU treats as "agreed" and no longer subject to debate. The subheads included: "Serious Consequences are Produced by the Erroneous Practice of Using the Congresses [of individual parties] to Attack Another Party"; "Open and Unilateral Censure of a Brother Party Does not Contribute to the Solution of Problems"; and "Marxism-Leninism Holds that the People, Who Determine the Course of History, Constitute the Sole and Certain Majority."

CONFIDENTIAL

- 5 -

At the 2 January anniversary celebrations, Castro defined Cuba's policy in the dispute on a speakers' platform decorated in such a way as to dramatize the posture of neutrality. The stand was adorned with pictures of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and several Cuban revolutionaries, including Marti and Castro, but none of Khrushchev or Mao. Yet in a situation in which Moscow is the established mentor of the communist world and Peking the challenger, the practice of nonpartisanship inevitably favors the latter. Havana's show of impartiality in effect elevates Peking's stand to a position of equality with the Soviet that Moscow denies it, and the Cuban stance emerges as a pro-Peking "neutrality."

Patently aware of the nature of the tightrope it has chosen to walk in its treatment of the interparty quarrel, the Cuban press has resisted succumbing to an apparently active agitation by Chinese publicity representatives in Havana. It has carried in full (in EL MUNDO) the polemical 7 January PRAVDA editorial, a major manifesto of the Soviet position, with a frontpage editorial note explaining noncommittally that the document was being printed out of "regard for its significance." It has carried no CPR counterpart as yet, although Chinese materials have been abundantly available. An 8 January dispatch transmitted by the Polish press agency correspondent in Havana to his home office in Warsaw reported that during the period following Havana's publicity for the 15 December Chinese editorial,

neither the [Havana] press nor any official speeches touched on the matter of the discussion and the differences of statements in the socialist camp. Only when Fidel Castro touched on this problem in his [anniversary] speech of 2 January was this silence broken. During the past week the press did not return to this problem, despite the fact that a daily bulletin issued by NCNA in Havana accurately and regularly provided texts of articles and declarations on this theme from Chinese, Albanian, and other sources.

The Polish correspondent went on to note that NCNA had made available a text of PEOPLE'S DAILY's 31 December editorial, which continued the polemic in ostensible rebuttal to Togliatti's attack on the CCP at the Italian party congress, but that the Havana press had not carried this editorial.

Nor has the Havana press utilized some pro-Soviet materials supplied to it by its own PRENSA LATINA correspondents in Latin America. On 9 January, for example, PRENSA LATINA's correspondent in Santiago, Chile, transmitted to the home office in Havana this statement by Chilean party leader Jose Gonzales:

"On the surface the Albanian leaders appear to be Marxist-Leninists, partisans and defenders of the declaration of the

CONFIDENTIAL

- 6 -

81, but in deeds, in the essence of their policies and activities, they are in disagreement with and violate the program of the communists of the world.... Among the lessons of the Caribbean crisis is the fact that imperialism is not a paper tiger. It is the fiercest enemy of the peoples.... The USSR supports Castro's five points. Friendly relations between the USSR and Cuba have been strengthened."

Gonzales went on to say that war is not inevitable and to declare that "at this point in the development of the communist movement it is not possible to tolerate deviations." PRENSA LATINA did not distribute this dispatch to its subscribers, and the Cuban press did not use it.

Hints of Friction Within the Regime

In the anniversary speech Castro had conveyed no suggestion of frictions within his own regime beyond the vague references to a need for eliminating divisions "within" as well as "without." In the speech to the women's congress he seemed to bring the question of internal dissent closer to the surface:

"There were some isolated voices of criticism. As was logical, there were some who, confused in good faith or confused in bad faith, criticized the National Directorate of the Integrated Revolutionary Organizations on the matter of Cuba's attitude, immediately after the crisis, on the matter of inspection and the pirate flights. For them, apparently, we should allow ourselves to be inspected, as if to hallow the right of the imperialists to say what arms we may or may not have and to bring this country back to the time of the Platt Amendment, when the U.S. Government decided for us."

"Apparently these individuals thought that we should allow ourselves to be blown up, that we should allow Yankee planes to dive down over our antiaircraft batteries without giving orders to fire. This can never be expected of us, either, because the enemy must expect, every time he attacks us, that there will be a fight and no backing down."

The editorial two days earlier in HOY, entitled "For Unity Within and Without," had seemed calculated primarily to proclaim (and appeal for) a closing of ranks "within." HOY had specifically endorsed, and quoted directly, the plea for unity contained in the anniversary speech of "our supreme leader, Comrade Fidel Castro." PRENSA LATINA further quoted the editorial as saying:

"Comradeship among revolutionaries, Marxist-Leninist comradeship in our ranks, is the steel axis of unity, of the

CONFIDENTIAL

- 7 -

unity of our camp, of our unity, of the unbreakable and increasingly solid unity of all our people around the revolutionary power, the United Party of the Socialist Revolution, and our leader and guide, Fidel Castro."

Castro reinforced the demand for unity in more threatening terms in his speech to the women's congress, and reasserted Cuba's right to "think for itself":

"We closely united Cuban revolutionaries. Those who believe that they are going to fish in troubled waters are mistaken. Those who believe that in the face of this desire for unity, of the firmness and dignity of our people, they can opportunistically try to create confusion, to cast doubt on the rectitude of the Cuban directorate, are lamentably mistaken."

"Those who, taking advantage of the difficult circumstances which our country has had to face and must continue to face, foment division, are committing a deplorable offense of treason against the revolution, and the masses will oppose them... We need unity to resist. We need unity to win. We need unity more than ever to go forward, and with our unity, our firmness, and our line, we shall continue to go forward, facing the difficulties, facing the inconveniences, whatever they may be. We shall exercise our right to think for ourselves."

The behavior of the Cuban delegates at the recent bloc party congresses may shed some light on the timing of the decision to assert a neutral position and emphasize unity. "Old communist" Blas Roca represented Cuba at the Bulgarian and Hungarian congresses in November, and was markedly warm toward the Soviet Union and Khrushchev. Thus he declared at Sofia on 9 November:

"Cuba's policy is firm and reasonable. There is not the slightest expression of narrowmindedness, sectarianism, or adventurism in it. Cuba is all for peace. It defends peace and peaceful coexistence.... Our people are right to sing and dance, shouting: 'Fidel-Khrushchev, we are with both of them!'"

On 7 December at the Czechoslovak congress in Prague, when Blas Roca's turn to speak came Raul Roa took the floor to explain that Blas Roca could not be there "because of unfavorable flight conditions." Roa, according to PRENSA LATINA on 8 December, stressed Castro's five points as essential for peace in the Caribbean, noted close Cuban-Czechoslovak ties, and re-

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT

18 JANUARY 1963

- 8 -

marked that both countries "guide themselves in their relationships by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian and socialist internationalism."

Cuba's representative at the East German party congress in mid-January was a Fidelista, and his address to the congress seconded the line Castro had introduced at the beginning of the month. Delegate Armando Hart paid personal tribute to Khrushchev, who was present at the congress, and then, according to the East German ADN,

"expressed the regret of his party over the differences of opinion which have emerged in the communist world movement and stressed that the association of Cuba's revolutionary organizations regard the unity of the socialist family as an urgent imperative of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. At the present time the essential thing is not to further exacerbate the differences of opinion, and as he put it, to analyze and overcome them in a "Marxist-Leninist manner."

In the period between the Cuban crisis and the revolution anniversary, when Fidel Castro was making no speeches, most public statements in Havana had come from Hart and from Che Guevara, also a "new communist." Most of the statements were concerned with either economics or education, making Guevara (as Economics Minister) and Hart (as Education Minister) the logical spokesmen. But "old communist" Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, who was selected to go to Moscow to negotiate a new economics agreement, has also made some public speeches, and Blas Roca spoke as recently as 11 January.

Blas Roca also published an article in HOY, reported by PRENSA LATINA on 18 January, in which he praised Castro's calls for unity, explained that for the sake of unity the Cubans have refrained from publishing "inflammatory attacks or material which inflamed the controversy," and added,

"Therefore we rejoice that Comrade Khrushchev should have declared today that the Central Committee of the CPSU 'considers it useful to stop criticism of some parties by other parties and to allow time to calm passions.'"

CONFIDENTIAL

- 9 -

B. FANNING OF REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA

Castro's revolution anniversary speech and his subsequent address to the women's congress carried forward the flagrant proselytizing of the Cuban revolution that has characterized his statements since his advent to power. In the process, Castro made more apparent his preference for Peking's line as compared with Moscow's on the issue of revolution and "transition to socialism"--and dramatized one major factor underlying Cuba's elevation of Peking's line in the bloc dispute to equal stature with that of the power on which Cuba depends for its livelihood.

In the anniversary speech he paid due deference to the "basic principle" of peaceful negotiation of international problems:

Our position is not a position contrary to solutions or against peaceful solutions. We agree with the policy of discussion and negotiation of problems by peaceful means. We agree with that basic principle. We agree, too, with the policy of concession for concession.... We are for peace, but if we are attacked we are going to repel them with all our means.

On the subject of revolutions in Latin America he reiterated the consistent Cuban line that holds up the Cuban revolution as a model for the hemisphere:

"We are examples for the brother peoples of Latin America, because the captives, Mr. Kennedy, are not the Cubans. The captives are the millions of Indians and Latin Americans who are exploited by the Yankee monopolies, exploited by Yankee imperialism in Latin America.... If the workers and people of Latin America had weapons as our people do, we would see what would happen. We would see who are the real captives."

"We have the great historic task of bringing this revolution forward, of serving as an example for the revolutionaries of Latin America--and within the socialist camp, which is and always will be our family."

While basically no different from Castro's earlier public statements on the subject, these remarks were noteworthy for their omission of what had previously been a pro-forma disclaimer of intent to interfere in other countries' affairs. In his speech on last year's anniversary of the revolution, for example, he declared:

"Our policy is not one of intervention in other nations' affairs. The significance of the Cuban example is something

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT
18 JANUARY 1963

- 10 -

else, the lesson that Cuba has given the peoples. We know that only the people themselves can effect revolutions. What people could have come here to effect the revolution for us? We know that revolution is the work of a people, and we have boundless faith in the people, and we know that it is the people who will settle accounts in the end."

"Without arms and against the arms of the exploiters we began our fight. Without arms and against the arms of the exploiters the oppressed peoples will continue their fight sooner or later. That is what the traitorous governments should fear. That is what the governments of Latin America should fear, those governments that join and maneuver against our fatherland. They should be afraid because history dooms them."

Castro and other regime spokesmen had followed this line consistently, balancing statements on the exemplary nature of the Cuban revolution with the corollary that revolution is not exportable but a matter for "the peoples" of each country. In this year's anniversary speech, omitting the corollary, he spoke of "the duty of all revolution to recreate the revolution":

"The Venezuelan people struggled and gave extraordinary evidence of revolutionary spirit.... The imperialists were given evidence of what revolutionary solidarity is, the active solidarity of revolutionaries who do not sit in their doorways to wait for the corpse of their enemy to pass by, of revolutionaries who understand that the duty of all revolution is to recreate the revolution."

At the women's congress on 15 January he went further, again with no qualifying avowal of noninterference:

"We must bring them to the struggle, because that road is much easier in many Latin American countries than it was in Cuba."

"The number of deaths per year in Latin America, those who die of hunger and illness without assistance, is greater than those who would die in the liberation of the peoples of Latin America. Here the struggle cost 20,000 lives, but many times 20,000 lives already have been saved."

"What are needed are experts on changing the situation, experts on leading peoples in revolutions. That is the art of the revolutionaries, the art that must be learned and

CONFIDENTIAL

- 11 -

developed. How to bring the masses to the struggle? It is the masses who make history, but for them to make history the masses must be taken to the battle. That is the duty of the leaders and the revolutionary organizations--to make the masses march, to hurl the masses into battle."*

Again in the 15 January speech:

"There is something we want to clear up, because there have been some harebrained theoreticians who have declared that in Cuba there was a peaceful change from capitalism to socialism. That is like denying that thousands and thousands of militants fell in this country. It is like denying that an army from the bosom of the people in this country defeated a modern army, armed and instructed by Yankee imperialism."

"It was not a peaceful transition. It was a combat transition, without which there would not have been any transition in our country."

"These false interpretations of history do not conform with the situation of the majority of Latin American countries, where objective conditions exist--and the imperialists have clearly seen that objective conditions do exist--but where subjective conditions are missing. These subjective conditions must be created, and they are created by historic truth, not by falsification of history."

"We do not deny the possibility of peaceful transition, but we are still awaiting the first case. But we do not deny it, because we are not dogmatists, and we understand the ceaseless change of historic conditions and circumstances."

Moscow, whose own dogma has never precluded violence and whose own propaganda machine had vigorously supported the insurgents in the Sierra Maestra, has not in fact been holding up Cuba as an example of "peaceful transition to socialism." Castro's vehement assault on a straw man in the passage above seems calculated to strike at the whole Soviet concept of the feasibility of peaceful changeover, by insisting on the impossibility of peaceful methods in Cuba.

* Cuban commentator Luis Gomez Wanguemert, on television early in the morning of 17 January, may have been attempting to make up for Castro's omission of a qualifier regarding the nonexportability of revolution and to cover the vulnerability incurred by the omission. Gomez Wanguemert declared: "In most of Latin America the objective conditions for the triumph of the revolution do exist, as Dr. Castro said, and it is the duty of the leaders and revolutionary organizations in these countries to hurl the masses into the battle."

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT

18 JANUARY 1963

- 12 -

The Chinese and Soviet propaganda treatments of Castro's 15 January speech may serve as a measure of its orientation in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Thus Peking's NCNA on 16 January came out promptly with a long account of the speech, providing virtually full text of the portions on militant struggle. NCNA also reported that all Peking papers on 18 January gave frontpage play to the speech, PEOPLE'S DAILY using headlines including "We Want Peace, But We Will Never Abandon Our Revolution" and "The Cuban Revolution is no Peaceful Transition, But a Fighting Transition." Other subheads pointed up those aspects of the speech that harmonize with the Chinese line: "To Resist Aggression is to Fight for Peace"; "The Road of Surrender to the Aggressor is the Road that Leads to War, to the Enslavement of All Peoples." The Peking radio also devoted more than 20 minutes to a summary of the speech for Chinese domestic audiences; it subsequently broadcast long summaries in foreign languages, including Russian to the USSR.

Moscow gave negligible publicity to the women's congress, and TASS' innocuous 300-word account of Castro's speech highlighted his "stress" on "the important role of women in the revolution and in building up a new life in Cuba." The bulk of the TASS account pursued this theme, citing Castro's contrast between the problems facing women in other Latin American countries and the Cuban regime's success in overcoming the poverty inherited from capitalism. By way of example it noted Castro's statistics on the trebling of the number of hospital beds in Cuba under the revolution. TASS concluded by reporting Castro's pledge not to exacerbate the differences in the communist movement and to strive for unity. The Chinese account also included this pledge.

The differences between Moscow's and Peking's treatment of the speech reflect not only the Soviet and Chinese reactions to the speech itself, but accord with the general pattern of differences in Sino-Soviet treatment of Cuban accomplishments under Castro. Peking on both this year's and last year's Cuban revolution anniversaries harped single-mindedly on the exemplary nature of Cuba's militant "struggle" and the demonstration of the power of "the masses" afforded by the revolution. Moscow, this year as last, focused on Cuba's revolutionary advances under Castro, primarily in the economic sphere.

Cuba's Chinese-oriented view of "armed struggle" as the only acceptable method for revolution in Latin America had been asserted with unusual directness in Che Guevara's recent interview with the London DAILY WORKER, as transmitted by the WORKER's Havana correspondent to London on 29 November. Guevara did--unlike Castro--take some pains to make clear the idea that Cuba's role was simply to provide the example. But he was unequivocal in stating that "there is no other solution" than "armed

CONFIDENTIAL

- 13 -

struggle." The London DAILY WORKER, in publishing the interview, did not use these passages from its correspondent's dispatch:

"Major Guevara considered that the most effective form of help was the armed struggle already taking place in a number of Latin American countries where the people are in action to overthrow American imperialism."

"My final question to Major Guevara was on the contribution that the Cuban revolution has made in the development of Marxist thought and practice. His reply was typically modest, and he deliberately limited himself to the effects of the Cuban example in Latin America. 'The Cuban revolution,' he said, 'has shown that in conditions of imperialist domination such as exist in Latin America, there is no solution but armed struggle--for the people to take power out of the hands of the Yankee imperialists and the small group of the bourgeoisie that work with them. The question was, then,' he added, 'how this armed struggle could be most effectively carried through.'"

"'Cuba has shown,' he continued, 'that small guerrilla groups, well led and located in key points, with strong links with the masses of the people, can act as a catalyst of the masses, bringing them into mass struggle through action. Such action, to be convincing, must be effective, and guerrillas can be converted into an army which eventually can destroy the armed forces of the class enemy. We say,' Major Guevara continued, 'that this can be done in a large number of Latin American countries.' ... He pointed out that in Venezuela, Guatemala, Paraguay, and Colombia, guerrillas already are active in an armed struggle against the American imperialists and their henchmen."

"'There is no other solution possible in these countries except armed struggle. The objective conditions for this exist, and Cuba's example has shown these countries the way.'"^{*}

HOY in its frontpage editorial of 15 January expressed the Cuban line succinctly if more moderately than either Castro or Guevara:

"The imperialists understand the hemispheric significance of the Cuban revolution and want to extinguish the light of its example, which is lighting the way for the countries of Latin America."

* The WORKER also excised the passage in which Guevara said that if the Soviet rockets had not been removed, Cuba would have directed them at the United States "in our defense against aggression."

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT

18 JANUARY 1963

- 14 -

C. DEFIANCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Castro's fourth anniversary speech was 93 minutes long, and approximately 70 percent of this time was devoted to attacking President Kennedy and U.S. policies. This does not represent a fundamental departure from the pattern of past anniversary speeches. On 2 January 1962 more than half of Castro's speech was devoted to attacks on the United States. On the second anniversary, 2 January 1961, Castro delivered what amounted to two anniversary speeches: The first one, on 1 January, dealt entirely with domestic problems; the second, made at the anniversary celebration the next day, was devoted entirely to denunciations of the United States.*

Castro has had a news peg for such attacks at each of the past three anniversary celebrations. This year the anniversary ceremonies came a few days after President Kennedy met with the Bay of Pigs prisoners in Miami, and Castro used the President's appearance there as his main theme. In 1962 the Punta Del Este conference was being organized and had been set for 22 January; Castro in his 1962 speech emphasized the aims and plans of the United States and its Latin American "puppets" for this meeting and climaxed his address with a call for a Havana conference on the same date to draft the Second Declaration of Havana. In 1961 President Eisenhower had just broken relations with Cuba; Castro represented this as the final step prior to an invasion of Cuba and devoted his entire anniversary address to an exhortation to the Cuban people to resist U.S. "aggression."

Castro's latest anniversary speech was no less intemperate toward the United States than his earlier ones, and if anything went somewhat further in insulting the President personally. It differed from the past speeches principally by its frequent, insistent references to Cuban armed might, with the implication that Cuba now is well prepared to resist aggression. It also contained a certain amount of boasting in connection with the Bay of Pigs episode, presumably inspired by the prisoner release:

"Recently an event took place which, even if they try to ignore it, is a historic event. Imperialism agreed to pay our country the indemnity fixed by the revolutionary courts for the invaders of Playa Giron.... They call it ransom, but

* Fidel Castro also delivered an anniversary speech on 2 January 1960, but it was in Oriente Province and apparently was not broadcast by the Havana radio. No copy is available.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 15 -

we do not care what they call it. The fact is that they had to agree to pay indemnity and that for the first time in history imperialism paid a war indemnity. And why did they do it? Because they were beaten, because in Playa Giron the imperialists suffered their first great defeat in Latin America."

"We are respected now more than ever. And the best proof of this is the respect we inspire in the imperialists themselves. It is the respect inspired by a nation that has not been cowed by its power, that has not been cowed in four years of heroic struggle."

Castro devoted a large part of his speech to reading extracts from the President's Orange Bowl speech, then offering his comments. After reading the President's remarks concerning the brigade flag that was presented at the meeting with the prisoners, he declared:

"The story of the flag is a lie, a complete lie. Everyone knows that the mercenaries who came here dressed as 'silk worms,' as the people say, with camouflaged uniforms of the North American Army, were totally and absolutely surprised and captured. But not only that, everyone knows they left even their underwear. Now they have invented the story that one escaped and carried the flag in his clothes, and that is the flag they delivered to Kennedy."

President Kennedy's reference to Marti and other Cuban heroes brought this retort from Castro:

"To compare these mercenaries with Marti, to compare these mercenaries with the patriots of independence.... To compare the efforts of these patriots with these miserable individuals is an affront to the memory of these men."

This theme was taken up by commentator Kuchilan on 3 January in his daily commentary broadcast from Havana:

The worst part of Mr. Kennedy's speech was the brazenness of comparing the conduct of Jose Marti with the conduct of the mercenaries. This disrespectful comparison by the U.S. President--which among other things reveals his complete lack of knowledge of the history of America--is really an unforgivable offense.

In boasting of Cuba's armed might Castro once again conveyed his dissatisfaction with the outcome of the October crisis:

"We have more than good reason to mistrust the imperialists and we knew that guarantees can never be contained within the

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT
18 JANUARY 1963

- 16 -

mere word of the imperialists. Guarantees lie in our decision to fight, in our decision to resist historically any attack from the enemy. Guarantees lie in these arms you saw in this parade and many more weapons which were not shown in this parade. Guarantees lie in the hundreds of thousands of fighters."

"To live in chains is to live in opprobrium and affront, and to die for the homeland is to live.... That is why we took measures to arm ourselves, and that is why we agreed with the Soviet Union on the weapons that were set up here, because we understood that we were fulfilling our obligation: One, toward our country, fortifying its defenses in view of imperialist threats; and another obligation toward the peoples of the socialist camp, that is, an international proletarian duty."

"You know how the crisis was started, developed, and culminated. We mean to say that our people always reserve all rights in the face of their imperialist enemies to take all measures deemed pertinent and to possess the weapons deemed necessary. The Soviet Government, in search of peace, arrived at certain agreements with the North American Government, but this does not mean that we have renounced this right, the right to possess the weapons we deem proper and to take the international policy step we deem pertinent as a sovereign country."

Speaking immediately after the military parade, Castro made frequent reference to the arms exhibited in the parade, including the antiaircraft and coastal missiles. Reportedly the most elaborate yet held, the parade was the theme of numerous Havana broadcasts after 2 January. Kuchilan described it as "of course greater, bigger, and more enthusiastic" than those held earlier. On 4 January commentator Jose Miguel Fornes stated that "Cuba showed the world the might of its arms and its fighting spirit against all imperialist aggression." A broadcast to the Americas on the same day attributed to the conservative Uruguayan paper LA MANANA the statement that "Fidel Castro showed missiles of a type he was not known to have possessed." A broadcast to the Americas on 3 January went into more detail:

"The military parade in Havana proved the high defensive power of the Cuban revolutionary armed forces. The people saw for the first time coastal and antiaircraft rockets.... Antiaircraft equipment also was shown in the parade. The well known quadruple machinegun and 33-millimeter guns were manned by young communists. It is said that this type of

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT
18 JANUARY 1963

- 17 -

antiaircraft gun brought down a Yankee U-2 spy plane recently in the western region of the country.... The parade ended with the materiel which aroused great interest--the rockets, which were of two types, one antiaircraft and one coastal defense. It was announced that the antiaircraft rocket was capable of reaching and destroying enemy aircraft flying at the maximum ceiling."

On 3 January the "Friendly Voice of Cuba," a program in English beamed to North America, also dwelt on the military power of the Castro regime as exhibited in the parade:

"Cuba showed its power in armaments, the combat spirit of its people--the farmers, workers, students--as they stand ready to repel and to resist to the very end, to a winning finish, any and all imperialist aggressions. Our armed forces, as the military parade made evident, are no longer that army that had hardly anything but courage and determination.... Comrade Fidel Castro gave a worthy answer to Kennedy's threat and falsehood, and in a brief resume dealt with those responsibilities that lie ahead of us and outlined the course that we must follow."

"The revolution is not afraid to return these mercenaries to their masters, since, as stated by our Prime Minister and commanding chief, our armed forces can now deal with 50 other such invasions that might come simultaneously into our territory."

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT
18 JANUARY 1963

- 18 -

D. SUBORDINATION OF DOMESTIC ISSUES

Toward the end of his anniversary speech Castro summed up his main points, that Cuba should strive for unity both "within and without" and should strengthen its example for the revolutionaries of Latin America, and repeated the slogan that customarily ends his speeches: "Fatherland or death, we will win!" He started to leave the rostrum, then turned as if he had forgotten something, and said:

"This will be the Year of Organization. Why? Because we must place our main effort in organization; in the first place, organization of the living party of the socialist revolution, the development of organization of our masses, that is, our mass organizations, the organization of our administrative agencies and the organization of economic agencies. This does not imply that this year will not be for education. The principal impetus will be for organization. All years are years for education and all years will be years for organization. But this year we will place emphasis on organization. And for that reason it will be called the Year of Organization."

This rather incoherent paragraph was Castro's total comment, during his hour and a half speech, on the progress of the revolution at home and domestic aims for the future.

In each of his speeches on past anniversaries, Castro has explained and discussed at some length the slogan that represented the emphasis of regime activities for the coming year. The first year, 1959, was called the Year of Liberation, 1960 the Year of Agrarian Reform, 1961 the Year of Education, and 1962 the Year of Planning; 1963 is the Year of Organization. In his 1961 speech Castro had outlined the coming drive against illiteracy and announced confidently:

"When we have eradicated illiteracy we can proclaim at the beginning of the fourth year of the revolution that the Cuban revolution has done in one year what oligarchies and privileged classes could not do in 150 years. We are certain that we can achieve our aim. We are certain that we can say to the world that in our country there is not a single illiterate."

On 2 January 1962 he announced that the goal of eliminating illiteracy in one year had been met, boasted that Cuba was now leading the Western hemisphere in education, and went on to outline at length the results that

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PROPAGANDA REPORT

18 JANUARY 1963

- 19 -

would be achieved in the Year of Planning. He spoke expansively of the "thousands of technicians" that soon would begin to emerge from the universities and declared that careful planning in 1962 would reduce unemployment and lead to higher production and higher living standards.

Castro's concluding remarks in this year's anniversary speech, delivered as if in afterthought, served to preserve the tradition with at least a token explanation of this year's slogan. His preoccupation with international and intrabloc issues to the virtual exclusion of domestic affairs seemed in accord with the pattern of the past two months, when-- while Castro himself remained silent--Dorticos was reported taking a more active role than formerly in government activities, and various ministers (particularly Guevara and Hart) were serving as regime spokesmen.

Where last year's revolution anniversary article in CUBA SOCIALISTA was written by Castro, this year's was signed by Dorticos. According to PRENSA LATINA's report of the article on 1 January, Dorticos noted the "quickening pace of the process of socialization," giving "figures on the extent of the socialization of the national economy." He admitted "deviations and mistakes which caused delays and the use of resources," but asserted that "redeeming action was not long in coming" and "today we can state that not only the vanguard but the entire Cuban working class has been won over by the ideas of socialism." Dorticos declared that "with the help of the socialist camp" the Cuban revolution on its fourth anniversary could show "not only survival," but also "some advances and processes worthy of mention."

Some of these worthy advances included a claimed growth of the economy by 30 percent between 1958 and 1962, "which is equivalent to an annual increase of six to seven percent." In the earlier days of the revolution Castro had chosen 13 as the annual percentage of national growth which he said Cuba must follow in the immediate future.

Dorticos also wrote in CUBA SOCIALISTA that unemployment was "reduced from 500,000 in 1958 to 220,000 in 1962" and that "the labor reserve, which is a broader concept and includes in addition to the unemployed the semientployed and domestics, declined from 620,000 in 1958 to 300,000 in 1962." In many of his 1962 speeches Castro had claimed that unemployment had been wiped out. At present, an intensive campaign is under way to enlist tens of thousands of "volunteer workers" to avoid catastrophe in the sugar harvest. Dorticos admitted in his article that among the "costly errors" had been "a certain disregard of the importance to our economy of the sugar industry," which had "affected our export capacity."

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

UNCLASSIFIED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	SECRET
--------------	-------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

25X1

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	[Redacted]	<i>Cable</i>	
2	7E32 Holgate		
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN	
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE	

Remarks:

Herewith three copies Radio Propaganda Report on Cuban propaganda. I believe you will find paragraph b on page 9 especially relevant.

Section B

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

DATE

30 Jan 63

SECRET

(40)

FORM NO. 237 Use previous editions
2-61

* U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1961 O-567282